

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,995	05/11/2007	Greg H. Crocker	PKT-P1-06(US) 8906	
28710 7590 03/29/2011 PETER K. TRZYNA, ESQ. P O BOX 7131			EXAMINER	
			CAMPEN, KELLY SCAGGS	
CHICAGO, IL 60680			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
		,		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/29/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAR 2 9 2011

Peter Trzyna, Esq. P.O. Box 7131 Chicago, IL 60680

In re Application of

CROCKER, GREG H.

Application No. 10/575,995

Filed: APRIL 17, 2006

For: COMPUTER SUPPORT FOR

MORTGAGE LOCK OPTION

**DECISION ON PETITION** 

TO WITHDRAW

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

UNDER 37 CFR 1.181

This is a decision on applicant's Petition to the Commissioner which was filed June 14, 2010 requesting withdrawal of a restriction requirement made in an office action dated May 29, 2008 requesting that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

The petition is **DISMISSED** as moot.

A review of the record shows that a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 USC 121 and 35 USC 372 based on PCT Rule 13.1 directed to claims 1-45 was mailed on May 29, 2008. Applicant filed a response on December 1, 2008, electing with traverse Group I, claims 1-16. After receipt of Applicant's response, the examiner issued a non-final action on February 18, 2009. In the non-final action, the examiner responded to Applicant's arguments, maintained the restriction requirement and made the restriction requirement final. Applicant then filed a petition on June 14, 2010 requesting the restriction requirement be withdrawn. The Examiner withdrew the restriction requirement in an interview held on March 25, 2011 (copy of Interview Summary attached). Therefore, the petition is dismissed as moot.

Any questions regarding this decision should be directed to Alexander Kalinowski at (571) 272-

6771.

Wyna Coggins,

Technology Center Director Technology Center 3600

SM/ak 3/28/11

Attachment: copy of Interview Summary held March 25, 2011

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/575,995	CROCKER, GREG H.
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	KELLY CAMPEN	3691
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):	·
(1) <u>KELLY CAMPEN</u> .	(3)	•
(2) Peter Trzyna.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 25 March 2011.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2)  applicant's representative	e]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)□ No.	,
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-45</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached.	g) was not reached. h) h	I/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the genera reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	I nature of what was agreed to	if an agreement was
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amenallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.	copy of the amendments that v	reed would render the claims vould render the claims
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW OF THE INTERVIEW OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW OF T	e last Office action has already t OF ONE MONTH OR THIRT FERVIEW SUMMARY FORM,	y been filed, APPLICANT IS Y DAYS FROM THIS WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
·		
·		
·		
/Kelly Campen/		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant agreed to cancel corresponding claims to issued claim set in parent (10/867520) which correspond to elected claim set. Examiner agreed to examine non elected claim set subject to applicant submitting amendments to the claim set to more closely focus on inventive concept. Examiner agreed to withdraw the restriction requirement and Applicant agreed to formally withdraw lack of unity petition requirement as petition is now moot. Applicant agreed to cancel superfluous claims and to focus on inventive concept...